



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/009,573	12/12/2001	Herve Sainct	Q 67618	9696
23373	7590	09/22/2005	EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037			SHARMA, SUJATHA R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2684	

DATE MAILED: 09/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/009,573	SAINCT, HERVE	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sujatha Sharma	2684	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 July 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 2-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 2-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baum [WO 97/15992] in view of Cesaro [US 3,742,358].

Regarding claim 7, Baum discloses an air-borne platform that carries a communication payload. Baum further discloses a method where the aircraft includes propulsion means (see element 15 in fig. 2) enabling said aircraft to maintain itself, to move itself and to orient itself solely at high altitude (see page 6, line 23 – page 7, line 3, page 11, lines 21-28). Baum further discloses transceiver means for radio waves (see page 3, lines 1-15). Further Baum discloses a method wherein the said aircraft is being taken to an altitude and a position such that the said transceiver means lies in the same direction relative to atleast one user of said telecommunication network (see page 3, lines 22-29, page 4, line 5 – page 5, line 20).

Baum, however, does not explicitly disclose that the radio relay on the ground is replace by said aircraft.

Cesaro, in the same field of endeavor, teaches a method where a ground based radio relay system can be replaced by means of airborne apparatus in order to reduce radiation from ground based towers or masts. See col. 1, lines 14-18

Therefore it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use airborne apparatus as taught by Cesaro in Baum's invention in order to replace the ground based radio relay system by the airborne apparatus thus reducing radiation from ground based towers or masts.

Regarding claim 5, Baum further discloses a method of getting an aircraft onto station, the method being characterized by the following steps:

- on the ground, said aircraft (50 in Fig. 8) is secured to an independent transporter (51 in Fig.8)
- said transporter (51 in Fig. 8) takes said aircraft to a high altitude (position D in Fig. 8) at which it is to operate using solely propulsion means of said transporter (see page 13, lines 8 – 27)
- said transporter releases said aircraft at the altitude and atleast approximately at the intended location of its operating station (see fig. 8 and page 13, lines 8-27)
- if necessary, said aircraft uses its own propulsion means (15 in Fig. 2) to put itself on station and take up its proper orientation (see page 6, line 23 – page 7, line 3, page 11, lines 21-28)

Regarding claim 6, Baum further discloses a method where the transporter further comprises of atleast one balloon (51,57 in Fig. 8) suitable for rising to high altitude

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baum [WO 97/15992] and Cesaro [US 3,742,358] in view of Wong [WO 97/33790].

Regarding claim 2, Baum and Cesaro disclose all the limitations. However they fail to disclose a method wherein the propulsion means comprising atleast one plasma thruster, which operates using plasma, created from the surrounding air at said high altitude.

Wong, in the same field of endeavor, teaches a method of using a new propulsion system to overcome the inefficiencies of the conventional propellers. Further Wong teaches a method where the engine includes an electrode and the emitted electrons are accelerated by the surrounding electric field forming plasma of electrons, which is then used to propel the aircraft. See page 16, line 7 – page 17, line 15.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the above teachings of Wong to Baum and Cesaro in order to use a more efficient method of propulsion.

Regarding claim 3, Wong further teaches the use of solar generator in the aircraft which is cooled by convection (dissipating or radiating heat to the surrounding area. See page 22, lines 17-27 where it indicates that heat is discharged to the surrounding gas)

Regarding claim 4, Wong further teaches the use of atleast one storage battery in the aircraft. See page 15, lines 17-26.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 5/26/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues that the secondary reference Cesaro does not disclose a method of replacing the radio relay with an aircraft.

The examiner respectfully disagrees and draws the applicant's attention to the Cesaro reference col. 1, lines 14-18 where he teaches a method of removing the relay system from the ground and replacing that with airborne apparatus. Therefore the combination of Baum and Cesaro reads on the limitations of the independent claim 7.

Conclusion

2. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sujatha Sharma whose telephone number is 571-272-7886. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 7.30am - 4.00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nay Maung can be reached on 571-272-7882. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Sujatha Sharma
September 6, 2005

EDAN ORGAD
PATENT EXAMINER/TELECOMM.

L O, 9/12/05